1 Jay W. Eisenhofer Geoffrey C. Jarvis 2 Michael J. Barry Mary S. Thomas (State Bar No. 175110) GRANT & EISENHOFER P.A. 3 Chase Manhattan Centre 1201 North Market Street Wilmington, DE 19801 Tel: 302.622.7000 5 Fax: 302.622.7100 6 jeisenhofer@gelaw.com 7 Merrill Glen Emerick (State Bar No. 117248) ANDERLINI, FINKELSTEIN, EMERICK & SMOOT 400 S. El Camino Real – Suite 700 8 San Mateo, CA 94402 9 Tel: 650.348.0102 Fax: 650.348.0962 memerick@afeslaw.com 10 11 Attorneys for Proposed Lead Plaintiff The New York City Employees' Retirement System 12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 13 SAN JOSE DIVISION 14 15 In re APPLE COMPUTER INC. DERIVATIVE LITIGATION Master File No. C-06-04128-JF 16 RESPONSE OF THE NEW YORK CITY This Document Relates To: 17 EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM TO THE MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT MARTIN VOGEL and KENNETH 18 OF FINKELSTEIN & KRINSK LLP TO MAHONEY, on Behalf of Themselves and THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE 19 AND APPOINTMENT OF SARATOGA All Other Similarly Situated, PLAINTIFFS AS LEAD PLAINTIFF 20 Plaintiffs, Date: January 19, 2007 21 Time: 9:00 a.m. v. Courtroom 3, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor STEVEN JOBS, PETER OPPENHEIMER, Honorable Jeremy Fogel FRED ANDERSON, WILLIAM V. 23 CAMPBELL, MILLARD S. DREXLER, Case No.: C-06-05208-JF ALBERT GORE, Jr., ARTHUR D. LEVINSON, 24 JEROME B. YORK and APPLE COMPUTER. INC., Honorable Jeremy Fogel 25 Defendants. 26 27 28 Response of the The New York City Employees' Retirement Systems To The Motion For Appointment Of Finkelstein & Krinsk LLP To The Management Committee And Appointment Of Saratoga Plaintiffs As Lead

Plaintiff (Case No.: C06-04128-JF)

The New York City Employee's Retirement System ("NYCERS") submits this

1 2 response to the Motion For Appointment Of Finkelstein & Krinsk LLP To The Management 3 Committee And Appointment Of Saratoga Plaintiffs As Lead Plaintiff (the "Saratoga 4 Plaintiffs' Motion''), filed in *In re Apple Computers Inc. Derivative Litigation*, Master File No. 5 C-06-04128-JF (the "Derivative Litigation"). NYCERS takes no position with respect to the 6 Saratoga Plaintiffs' Motion, beyond to note that, although the motion was filed as relating to 7 "All Actions," neither the Saratoga Plaintiffs nor the court-designated Lead Plaintiffs in the 8 Derivative Litigation, purport to seek representation in or control over the claims asserted in 9 Vogel, et al. v. Jobs, et al., File No. C-06-05208 (the "Vogel Litigation"), which was deemed 10 "related" to the Derivative Litigation by Order dated November 21, 2006 (filed November 27,

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2006).

On October 24, 2006, in accordance with Section 21D(a)(3)(B) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B), as amended by Section 101(a) of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (the "PSLRA"), NYCERS applied to serve as the Lead Plaintiff in the Vogel Litigation. NYCERS was the only shareholder who moved for appointment as lead plaintiff in the *Vogel* Litigation in accordance with the PSLRA's statutory requirements. See 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(A)(l)(II). On November 13, 2006, Defendants in the *Vogel* Litigation, filed a response to NYCERS's motion that represented that "Defendants take no position on who should be appointed lead plaintiff or lead counsel in this [Vogel]

23

22

unopposed.1

24

25

26

27

28

action." Defendants' Response to Motion for Appointment of Lead Plaintiff, at 2, Case 5:06-

CV-05208-JF, Document 12, filed 11/13/06. NYCERS's outstanding motion, therefore, is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> NYCERS's motion originally was noticed for December 4, 2006, before the Honorable Marilyn H. Patel. By Order dated November 21, 2006, however, this Court found that the *Vogel* Litigation was related to the Derivative Litigation, vacated the notice of the hearing on NYCERS's outstanding motion for appointment as Lead Plaintiff. NYCERS has now renoticed the hearing on its outstanding and unopposed motion for appointment as Lead Plaintiff for February 23, 2007.

1	On December 18, 2006, the court-designated Lead Plaintiffs in the Derivative
2	Litigation filed the Consolidated Shareholder Derivative Complaint (the "Derivative
3	Complaint"). The Derivative Complaint does not assert any claims under the federal securities
4	laws on behalf of a class of investors who purchased securities issued by Apple Computers,
5	Inc. ("Apple"), which claims are at issue in the Vogel Litigation. The Saratoga Plaintiffs'
6	Motion does not seek appointment as lead plaintiff or lead counsel in the Vogel Litigation, and
7	indeed does not comply with the PSLRA's statutory requirements for purposes of seeking
8	appointment as lead plaintiff in that case in any event.
9	Dated: January 10, 2007
10	Respectfully submitted,
11	GRANT & EISENHOFER P.A.
	/s/ Mary S. Thomas
12	Jay W. Eisenhofer
13	Geoffrey C. Jarvis
14	Michael J. Barry Mary S. Thomas (State Bor No. 175110)
15	Mary S. Thomas (State Bar No. 175110) Chase Manhattan Centre
	1201 N. Market Street Wilmington, DE 19801
16	Tel: 302-622-7000
17	ANDERLINI, FINKELSTEIN, EMERICK & SMOOT
18	Merrill Glen Emerick (State Bar No. 117248) 400 S. El Camino Real – Suite 700
19	San Mateo, CA 94402 Tel: 650.348.0102
20	Fax: 650.348.0962
21	memerick@afeslaw.com
22	Attorneys for Proposed Lead Plaintiff The New York City Employees' Retirement System
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	